

| | | |
|-----------------|--------------|---------------|
| Garrett | Lummis | Roskam |
| Gibbs | MacArthur | Ross |
| Gibson | Marchant | Rothfus |
| Gohmert | Marino | Rouzer |
| Goodlatte | Massie | Royce |
| Gosar | McCarthy | Russell |
| Gowdy | McCauley | Ryan (WI) |
| Granger | McClintock | Salmon |
| Graves (GA) | McHenry | Sanford |
| Graves (LA) | McKinley | Scalise |
| Graves (MO) | McMorris | Schock |
| Griffith | Rodgers | Schweikert |
| Grothman | McSally | Scott, Austin |
| Guinta | Meadows | Sensenbrenner |
| Guthrie | Meehan | Sessions |
| Hanna | Messer | Shimkus |
| Hardy | Mica | Shuster |
| Harper | Miller (FL) | Simpson |
| Hartzler | Miller (MI) | Smith (MO) |
| Heck (NV) | Moolenaar | Smith (NE) |
| Hensarling | Mooney (WV) | Smith (NJ) |
| Herrera Beutler | Mullin | Smith (TX) |
| Hice (GA) | Mulvaney | Stefanik |
| Hill | Murphy (PA) | Stewart |
| Holding | Neugebauer | Stivers |
| Hudson | Newhouse | Stutzman |
| Huelskamp | Noem | Thompson (PA) |
| Huizenga (MI) | Nugent | Thornberry |
| Hultgren | Nunes | Tiberi |
| Hunter | Olson | Tipton |
| Hurd (TX) | Palazzo | Trott |
| Hurt (VA) | Palmer | Turner |
| Issa | Paulsen | Upton |
| Jenkins (KS) | Pearce | Valadao |
| Jenkins (WV) | Perry | Wagner |
| Johnson (OH) | Peterson | Walberg |
| Jolly | Pittenger | Walden |
| Jones | Pitts | Walker |
| Jordan | Poe (TX) | Walorski |
| Joyce | Poliquin | Weber (TX) |
| Katko | Pompeo | Webster (FL) |
| Kelly (PA) | Posey | Wenstrup |
| King (IA) | Price (GA) | Westerman |
| King (NY) | Ratcliffe | Westmoreland |
| Kinzinger (IL) | Reed | Whitfield |
| Kline | Reichert | Williams |
| Knight | Renacci | Wilson (SC) |
| Labrador | Ribble | Wittman |
| LaMalfa | Rice (SC) | Womack |
| Lamborn | Rigell | Woodall |
| Lance | Roby | Yoder |
| Latta | Roe (TN) | Yoho |
| LoBiondo | Rogers (AL) | Young (AK) |
| Long | Rogers (KY) | Young (IA) |
| Loudermilk | Rohrabacher | Young (IN) |
| Love | Rokita | Zeldin |
| Lucas | Rooney (FL) | Zinke |
| Luetkemeyer | Ros-Lehtinen | |

NOES—181

| | | |
|---------------|--------------|----------------|
| Adams | Cuellar | Jackson Lee |
| Aguilar | Cummings | Jeffries |
| Ashford | Davis (CA) | Johnson (GA) |
| Bass | Davis, Danny | Johnson, E. B. |
| Beatty | DeFazio | Kaptur |
| Becerra | DeGette | Keating |
| Bera | Delaney | Kelly (IL) |
| Beyer | DeLauro | Kennedy |
| Bishop (GA) | DelBene | Kildee |
| Blumenauer | DeSaulnier | Kilmer |
| Bonamici | Deutch | Kind |
| Boyle (PA) | Dingell | Kirkpatrick |
| Brady (PA) | Doggett | Kuster |
| Brown (FL) | Doyle (PA) | Langevin |
| Brownley (CA) | Ellison | Larsen (WA) |
| Bustos | Engel | Larson (CT) |
| Butterfield | Eshoo | Lawrence |
| Capps | Esty | Lee |
| Capuano | Farr | Levin |
| Cárdenas | Fattah | Lewis |
| Carney | Foster | Lieu (CA) |
| Carson (IN) | Frankel (FL) | Lipinski |
| Cartwright | Fudge | Loeb |
| Castor (FL) | Gabbard | Lofgren |
| Castro (TX) | Gallagher | Lowenthal |
| Chu (CA) | Garamendi | Lowe |
| Cicilline | Graham | Lujan Grisham |
| Clark (MA) | Grayson | (NM) |
| Clarke (NY) | Green, Al | Luján, Ben Ray |
| Clay | Green, Gene | (NM) |
| Cleaver | Grijalva | Lynch |
| Clyburn | Gutiérrez | Maloney, |
| Cohen | Hahn | Carolyn |
| Connolly | Heck (WA) | Maloney, Sean |
| Conyers | Higgins | Matsui |
| Cooper | Himes | McCollum |
| Costa | Honda | McDermott |
| Courtney | Huffman | McGovern |
| Crowley | Israel | McNerney |

| | | |
|-------------|------------------|----------------|
| Meeks | Richmond | Swalwell (CA) |
| Meng | Roybal-Allard | Takai |
| Moore | Ruiz | Takano |
| Moulton | Ruppersberger | Thompson (CA) |
| Murphy (FL) | Rush | Thompson (MS) |
| Nadler | Ryan (OH) | Titus |
| Napolitano | Sánchez, Linda | Tonko |
| Neal | T. | Torres |
| Nolan | Sanchez, Loretta | Tsongas |
| Norcross | Sarbanes | Van Hollen |
| O'Rourke | Schakowsky | Vargas |
| Pallone | Schiff | Veasey |
| Pascarella | Schrader | Vela |
| Payne | Scott (VA) | Velázquez |
| Pelosi | Scott, David | Visclosky |
| Peters | Serrano | Walz |
| Pingree | Sewell (AL) | Wasserman |
| Pocan | Sherman | Schultz |
| Polis | Sinema | Waters, Maxine |
| Price (NC) | Sires | Watson Coleman |
| Quigley | Slaughter | Welch |
| Rangel | Smith (WA) | Wilson (FL) |
| Rice (NY) | Speier | Yarmuth |

NOT VOTING—14

| | | |
|-------------|----------|---------------|
| Brady (TX) | Forbes | Johnson, Sam |
| Carter (TX) | Harris | Nunnelee |
| Duckworth | Hastings | Perlmutter |
| Edwards | Hinojosa | Walters, Mimi |
| Fincher | Hoyer | |

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1413

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1415

NATURAL GAS PIPELINE PERMITTING REFORM ACT

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 38, I call up the bill (H.R. 161) to provide for the timely consideration of all licenses, permits, and approvals required under Federal law with respect to the siting, construction, expansion, or operation of any natural gas pipeline projects, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 38, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 161

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act”.

SEC. 2. REGULATORY APPROVAL OF NATURAL GAS PIPELINE PROJECTS.

Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717f) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(1)(1) The Commission shall approve or deny an application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity for a prefilled project not later than 12 months after receiving a complete application that is ready to be processed, as defined by the Commission by regulation.

“(2) The agency responsible for issuing any license, permit, or approval required under Federal law in connection with a prefilled project for which a certificate of public convenience and necessity is sought under this

Act shall approve or deny the issuance of the license, permit, or approval not later than 90 days after the Commission issues its final environmental document relating to the project.

“(3) The Commission may extend the time period under paragraph (2) by 30 days if an agency demonstrates that it cannot otherwise complete the process required to approve or deny the license, permit, or approval, and therefor will be compelled to deny the license, permit, or approval. In granting an extension under this paragraph, the Commission may offer technical assistance to the agency as necessary to address conditions preventing the completion of the review of the application for the license, permit, or approval.

“(4) If an agency described in paragraph (2) does not approve or deny the issuance of the license, permit, or approval within the time period specified under paragraph (2) or (3), as applicable, such license, permit, or approval shall take effect upon the expiration of 30 days after the end of such period. The Commission shall incorporate into the terms of such license, permit, or approval any conditions proffered by the agency described in paragraph (2) that the Commission does not find are inconsistent with the final environmental document.

“(5) For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘prefilled project’ means a project for the siting, construction, expansion, or operation of a natural gas pipeline with respect to which a prefiling docket number has been assigned by the Commission pursuant to a prefiling process established by the Commission for the purpose of facilitating the formal application process for obtaining a certificate of public convenience and necessity.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 161.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to natural gas production, we are number one. What was once a pipe dream is now a global reality, thanks to American ingenuity and technology. An impressive accomplishment, especially considering where we were only a decade ago—fearful of running out of supplies.

With this new wealth of natural gas, folks in Michigan and across the country should no longer worry about access to affordable energy. But budget-busting power bills are still hitting too many Americans.

The New York Times recently reported that customers in New England could expect electricity rates to spike

close to 40 percent higher this winter. Why? Well, we may have fixed our supply problems, but now we have a serious distribution problem. Our archaic energy infrastructure and outdated regulatory system is blocking American consumers from reaping the benefits of our energy abundance. We have the gas, but we don't have the pipelines to get cheap energy directly to families and businesses that need it most.

This legislation seeks to fix the problem, inserting accountability into the permitting process for natural gas pipelines and establishing firm deadlines for agency reviews. It does not exempt any environmental laws. It just makes sure pipeline projects get sited and built without unnecessary delay.

Last night, the President here made the case for more Federal funding of transportation infrastructure projects like roads and bridges as one way to create jobs while modernizing our economy. But the energy infrastructure projects unleashed by this pipeline bill are every bit as necessary, with all of the economic benefits, and the best part is, since they will be paid for by the private sector, it won't cost taxpayers a dime.

We voted on this legislation last Congress, and it passed the House with overwhelming bipartisan support. With the President's comments last night about wanting to work with Congress, I hope the President can join us in supporting this bipartisan, commonsense energy and jobs solution. Now that we are the leader in energy production, there is no reason America shouldn't be number one in energy affordability as well.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume and rise in opposition to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to my colleague, the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, when he said that the likelihood is that we are going to have more and more pipelines constructed, pipelines that have to go through the FERC process, and that is certainly true, but all the more reason why we shouldn't be voting or supporting this bill.

I have to say I am talking not just in general in the abstract but from personal experience. In my district a few years ago, when I was a Congressman, in Edison, New Jersey, we had a natural gas pipeline explosion. Fortunately, no one was killed or seriously injured, but a whole apartment complex was wiped out, not just one building but a series of them. There was a real danger of loss of life.

It scares me, Mr. Speaker, to think that we would want to change the process whereby FERC has the opportunity to look at the safety of these pipelines when they are proposed for permitting and somehow short-circuit that process because of my own experience in my congressional district in Edison, New Jersey. Durham Woods was the name of the complex.

So many of these pipelines, as a lot more pipelines are being built, a lot of

them are in densely populated areas. So it is a major concern that FERC has to look at when reviewing these pipelines and deciding whether to issue a permit. It is not as if they are in places with no people. They are often in densely populated areas, like in my State of New Jersey.

In addition, this bill is unnecessary. The nonpartisan Government Accountability Office concluded that the FERC pipeline permitting process is predictable and consistent and gets pipelines built. In fact, over 90 percent are approved or at least decided within the 12-month cycle limitation that this bill is proposing.

The pipeline companies actually testified before the GAO that the process for permitting through FERC "is generally very good" and that the sector "enjoys a favorable legal and regulatory framework for the approval of new infrastructure."

So if the process is fine, why are we now trying to move ahead and endanger safety by coming up with limitations on the process that actually is very good?

I would also say that if you have a 12-month limit, which is what this bill proposes on FERC's ability to issue a permit, it is very possible that the process of permitting could be slowed down because if FERC decides that they don't have enough time within 12 months to decide whether a pipeline should be built and it is safe, they may just decide to not grant the permit and deny it for fear that they haven't had enough time to deal with it over the 12 months. I think it is not only unnecessary, but it may actually even be counterproductive to what the sponsors are trying to accomplish.

I would also point out that we are wasting our time because the President has issued a Statement of Administration Policy saying that if H.R. 161 were to reach his desk, that he would actually veto it. I am not going to get into all the specifics of why because I think they are a lot of the same reasons I am mentioning myself.

Now, let me say what happens. When faced with this 12-month deadline, not only FERC but also other agencies that deal with the Clean Air Act or the Clean Water Act or the Endangered Species Act, other agencies that have the authority to review this and permit this under the bill, would actually only have 3 months, 90 days. So after the 12-month period ends for FERC, then there is a 90-day period for the other agencies to act. And if they don't act within 90 days, then FERC is required under this legislation to issue a permit and say that those other regulatory concerns are met.

So now you are going to have FERC not only limited in its 12-month review but also then issuing permits under the Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, and these other environmental regulations, which it has nothing to do with. Essentially you are saying the other agencies have no role anymore because if

they don't decide within 90 days, FERC has to approve those permits as well. FERC doesn't normally deal with these other issues.

Another thing which I think is important is the eminent domain issue. If the permit is approved by FERC, then that means the company that is building the pipeline has the right to use eminent domain for the land where the pipeline is going to go through. I have a lot of concern about whether or not eminent domain should be used in those circumstances, particularly if the permit process has been short-circuited.

So I think that sometimes my colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't understand that these permits are very detailed documents. They include emission limits, technology operating requirements, conditions to protect the environment. FERC doesn't have the expertise or the resources to issue the permits for these other statutes like the Clean Air Act and the Endangered Species Act.

So I am just saying that I think that this legislation from a practical point of view is entirely unworkable. It just doesn't work. It doesn't work. The GAO has said that the process that we have now is fine. And for those of us who have had these accidents where we have had explosions and danger, the last thing that we want is these pipelines going through densely populated areas that haven't had the proper review to protect the safety and the health of our residents. For all of these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO) who is the author of H.R. 161.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I rise in support of H.R. 161.

We are tens of thousands of miles of pipeline capacity short of the necessary pipelines to carry natural gas to consumers who need it and businesses who demand it today in America. You don't have to take my word for it—prices will tell you.

The gentleman from New Jersey just said he opposes this bill. Allow him to explain to his constituents why they pay six or seven or eight times as much for natural gas as someone else in the Midwest, or in places where there is adequate pipeline capacity today. It is unnecessary; it is unconscionable. America now has the resources to provide this gas to all Americans so they can heat their homes and cool their homes, so businesses can use natural gas to build products here in America. We no longer live in a world with energy scarcity here in America. We have an opportunity to get this product from where it is found to the consumers and businesses that are demanding it.

The other side of the aisle may tell you we don't have a problem, but I will

tell you that as you talk to your constituents, as one who does this all the time, constituents say: I am paying too much for my product. This is a solution that will work.

We don't make in this legislation a single change to the Clean Water Act, not one change to the Clean Air Act, not a single change to any legislation that has to do with pipeline safety. Not one. All those laws remain in effect. All we ask the government to do is its job. We give them a timeline. We give them ample time. If 12 months is not enough, I am happy to give them 13. We will change the legislation.

But, in fact, the opposition isn't because this is being rushed but because in fact this will speed the process. That is why folks are opposed. They know this will produce this gas in a way that is safe and reasonable, and we will have great outcomes. And yet they want to keep this product in the ground. That is the real reason for opposition to this bill.

So those of us who want to get this energy to the consumers, to where it needs to go, I urge them to support this.

Frankly, when you read the articles about the challenges of pipeline capacity in America, the place it impacts the most isn't the place from which I hail. It is not Kansas; it is not the Midwest. It is, in fact, the densely populated areas of the Northeast. They are the places that need this energy the most and the soonest and the safest, and we can get it for them. I urge those who live in those places to talk to their constituents and to do the work to make sure that they understand what H.R. 161 can accomplish for the people in the areas that they represent.

You know, this administration has taken a lot of efforts to reduce the capacity of coal to provide energy for businesses and consumers. I regret that. I am doing my best to push back in every place that we can, as I know our chairman is as well. But as coal-fired power plants become more difficult to build, the need for natural gas will become even more increased.

□ 1430

This legislation is aimed directly at making sure that we don't have shortages and outages and catastrophes in energy production and energy delivery that America cannot afford.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 161.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS).

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 161, the so-called Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act.

My home State of Massachusetts, like many areas around the country, faces serious energy challenges. We need careful and strategic long-term planning in order to lower energy prices and increase reliability. Increasing

access to additional sources of natural gas could help address some of New England's energy challenges, including energy prices, which have historically been above the national average.

However, this legislation would move us in the wrong direction. This bill would force FERC to rush decision-making, including environmental reviews and assessments of the need for natural gas, while also hobbling decisions regarding the appropriate size of the proposed pipeline. It would turn FERC into a superpermitting agency, an authority that FERC neither wants nor has the expertise to carry out.

In my home district, we are currently navigating the FERC process that this bill purports to improve. The company is proposing to build a new 250-mile natural gas pipeline that crosses three States, including seven communities that I represent. I have heard from hundreds of my constituents expressing their concerns with this project.

Construction of the pipeline could jeopardize local wildlife and will impact both State and federally designated conservation lands, as well as Massachusetts' scarce farmland.

Thanks to extensive public review and input, the pipeline route has already been adjusted to minimize some of the environmental impacts, but there are still many outstanding concerns that deserve careful scrutiny. The proposed route still passes through local farmland, parks, wildlife management areas, wetlands, near schools, and across drinking water supplies.

My constituents have been grateful for a process that has given them the time to provide input. This bill would short-circuit that process and short-change my constituents' right to be heard.

I proposed an amendment to this legislation with my colleague Mr. McGovern that would exempt any pipeline from the arbitrary timelines established in the bill if the proposed route crosses Federal, State, or local land designated for conservation or recreation. However, the majority blocked this simple amendment from coming to the floor and receiving an up-or-down vote.

In Massachusetts, we have a long-standing history of preserving national habitats and protecting open spaces for the public benefit, and we have invested significant public resources towards these goals. Members should have been given the opportunity to vote on whether or not we should allow for a thorough review process to protect State investments.

On behalf of my constituents, I ask my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. HANNA).

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act.

Increased production of American natural gas has led to lower prices and more demand for this energy source all across the Nation. That is especially true in cold, energy-dependent regions like upstate New York and the Northeast. We need new infrastructure, specifically pipelines, to safely transport fuels to markets where they are needed.

Unfortunately, the Government Accountability Office reported that an average processing time for interstate natural gas pipeline projects was 558 days. This bill would expedite the government's review process for pipeline applications, to make sure that we are doing all we can to build infrastructure in a timely and responsible manner.

More access to affordable American natural gas will help fuel farms, heat homes, and power small businesses in upstate New York and throughout this country. Building pipelines will create good-paying jobs, as well as boost revenues and development in communities across the Nation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Some of my Republican colleagues just suggested that this bill would not waive any environmental requirements. For instance, yesterday, at the Rules Committee, the sponsor of the legislation indicated that H.R. 161 did not waive or alter any applicable environmental requirements under the Clean Air Act or NEPA.

While it is true that this legislation does not actually amend any provisions of the Clean Air Act or other environmental statutes, the bill would require automatic issuance of a pipeline-related permit under statutes like the Clean Air Act, if the responsible agency, such as EPA, has failed to act within the 90 days. This is the 90 days beyond the 1 year that I mentioned before.

Basically, that makes FERC the agency that would issue the Clean Air Act permit. Under this bill, FERC would decide how to create a BLM right-of-way permit or a Clean Water Act discharge permit. As a result, the legislation would effectively override the permitting decisions of agencies like EPA or DOI and turn FERC into a superpermitting agency.

I just want to point out, while it is true that the text of the actual Clean Air Act might remain unchanged under this bill, the effect of the bill would be that the Clean Air Act permits would be automatically issued by FERC if EPA fails to act within 90 days.

That is a major and substantive change from the way these laws work and, in effect, amounts to a waiver of environmental requirements for all practical purposes, Mr. Speaker.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time we have remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 24 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 19 minutes remaining.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just like to clarify that H.R. 161 is certainly not any drastic piece of legislation.

The Energy Policy Act of 2005 designated the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission as the lead agency charged with coordinating and reviewing natural gas pipeline project applications; therefore, FERC conducts the environmental review of each project as required under the National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, and is given authority to set deadlines for other agencies to issue an approval or denial of an associated permit.

When these applications are filed at FERC, the application also is given to other agencies that may have jurisdiction over the Clean Water Act, maybe like the Corps of Engineers, the Clean Air Act, the EPA perhaps, or Endangered Species; so it is not like they just have 90 days to look at this. They get the application the same time as FERC does.

The problem that FERC has had—and they have had both Democrat and Republican Commissioners come to Congress and say that they need more authority over these other agencies, so this bill does precisely that.

Once FERC has made a final determination and completed its process, it gives the other agencies another 90 days—even though they have been working on it for a year in advance of that—another 90 days to complete it, and if they want another 30 days, then they can do that as well.

I would just say that this is not rushing the process; it is simply completing the 2005 Energy Policy Act that gives FERC authority. We give them authority, but we don't give them any enforcement mechanism, and so this is precisely what this legislation does.

I might also add that having deadlines for agencies to act when doing environmental reviews or issuing permits is not really that strange or unique of an idea. Canada, Australia, and most European Union nations have deadlines for their environmental regulatory agencies to act.

Any person that is doing any kind of business in America knows the bureaucracy that we all run into, and it is easy to criticize bureaucracies. We know that they are dedicated, committed citizens trying to protect the environment, protect the American people, and we commend them for doing that, but we also know that they frequently let things slide.

It is easy to lose the process. We hear common complaints—nonstop—about delay, delay, delay. We know from hearings on this—this bill has already passed the House once—but we know from hearings that the Northeastern United States is really vulnerable to not having sufficient natural gas to meet their needs.

They are closing nuclear power plants. The President is making sure

you can't build a new coal plant in America. Existing coal plants, many of them are going to be going out of business because of extreme regulations of this climate-driven administration. We have heard testimony about the escalating prices of electricity for people.

This is designed to provide the infrastructure to get the natural gas where it needs to be, and the Northeast is one of those areas. That is really what this bill is about. It is about giving FERC some real authority, setting in statute that these agencies must act within a certain amount of time.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I really don't understand. I respect my colleague from Kentucky a great deal, but he seems to be arguing that we need the deadlines in this bill to hold Federal agencies accountable and ensure that they don't just somehow sit on the applications.

As I have already noted, since 2009, FERC has completed action on 91 percent of natural gas pipeline applications within 12 months, so a 12-month deadline isn't needed for more than 90 percent of the applicants.

My colleagues have asked: Well, what is the problem with holding the remaining 9 percent to a 12-month deadline? Well, the problem is it becomes a one-size-fits-all approach that fails to consider a wide range of applications that FERC has to review.

Some of the applications are for new projects—again, a small number—which span hundreds of miles, cross waterways and wetlands, and pass through neighborhoods and habitats of threatened wildlife; and questions of eminent domain need to be considered. In these cases, there can be unresolved safety, environmental, and legal issues at the local or State level.

Again, as I said, the President has said that he would veto this bill. In the Statement of Administration Policy, they specifically say:

The small percentage of decisions that have taken longer than 1 year involve complex proposals that merit additional review and consideration.

Mr. Speaker, if there is a complex project or there is some unaddressed risk to safety or the environment, we need to allow FERC or other Federal agencies the time to ensure that the pipeline is safe, so we don't have an accident like what occurred in Edison, New Jersey, in my district.

The last thing anyone needs, including the pipeline owner, is a pipeline explosion or other dangerous pipeline malfunction, and these things have occurred. I witnessed it myself in my district.

I am just saying don't put a hard deadline on the most complex projects that raise the possibility that FERC will be forced to approve a pipeline that is not safe or to reject an application solely because the Commission lacks sufficient time for an adequate review that will hinder rather than

help us get more natural gas where it needs to go.

Now, my colleague also mentioned the issue about the Northeast electricity supply or prices, and I just wanted to address that concern. New England is using more natural gas to generate electricity and more natural gas for heating homes than in the past, and on the coldest winter days, when natural gas is needed for heating or electricity, there is more demand, but this bill doesn't do anything to solve that problem.

The problem in New England isn't caused by pipeline applications that take too long to get approved by FERC; the problem is that the pipeline companies aren't even submitting the applications because they haven't figured out who is going to pay for these new pipelines. The pipeline companies haven't been satisfied there is a sufficient year-round demand to justify and finance the pipelines.

That is an issue that FERC is looking at and has been holding stakeholder conferences about, but this has nothing to do with Mr. POMPEO's bill.

□ 1445

Cutting corners on the permitting process isn't going to help additional pipeline capacity built for the Northeast. I don't think we ought to be blaming the government for every problem, which is what I hear my colleagues on the Republican side doing. The reality is that FERC and the government didn't create this problem. It is a problem of economics, and the faster we understand that the faster we can try to find a solution, but let's not act as if FERC's inability to act is the problem here. That is not the case.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

When we had hearings on this bill, the natural gas pipeline industry estimated that by the year 2035 an estimated \$8 billion each year would need to be spent to keep pace with the anticipated need for more pipeline infrastructure.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is absolutely correct in that Congress can't make these decisions. Private companies have to make the decision if they are going to invest the dollars to build these pipelines, but they have talked to us—the FERC Commissioners have talked to us—about the fact that some of these agencies are just delaying for no apparent reason. As I said earlier, when the application is filed at FERC, the other agencies receive those applications, and they have the same amount of time to work on it. This legislation simply sets some guidelines for these Federal agencies so that, when FERC completes its chore—and it is the quarterback in the decision of approving these pipelines—these agencies must also step up to the plate.

This legislation is not radical in any way. It is certainly not rushing the

process. It is not doing that. Pursuant to the 2005 Energy Policy Act, it is simply making it a more efficient, speedy process while, at the same time, protecting the environment and the best interests of the American people.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from New Jersey have additional speakers?

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I do not, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am not going to read the whole thing, Mr. Speaker, but I did just want to make reference to some part of the Statement of Administration Policy's saying that the President would veto the bill:

The administration recognizes the need for additional energy infrastructure and supports the timely consideration of project applications. The administration, however, strongly opposes the bill because it would allow the automatic approval of natural gas pipeline projects if the FERC or other Federal agencies do not issue the required permit, license, or approval within rigid, unworkable timeframes.

H.R. 161 could create conflicts with existing statutory and regulatory requirements and practices and preclude opportunities for engaging the public and potentially impacted communities, thereby causing confusion and the risk of increased litigation. The bill's requirements could force agencies to make decisions based on incomplete information or information that may not be available, including potential environmental and community impacts of the proposed pipelines, within the stringent deadlines, and to deny applications that otherwise would have been approved but for the lack of sufficient review time. For these reasons, the bill may actually delay projects or lead to more project denials, undermining the intent of the legislation.

I stress to my colleagues on the other side that we understand there is a need for more pipelines, and we understand that these pipelines have to be approved in a timely fashion, but there is no reason to believe that that is not happening now. The danger here is that, in a case when these do have to have a more intensive review because of safety or health or environmental concerns, we may actually do the opposite. Either they are going to be denied because the agencies don't have enough time, or, God forbid, they get approved when they shouldn't be.

Again, I just don't quite understand what this is all about. It seems like the Republicans have a bill that they think is going to accomplish their goal and won't but that has a danger of really risking the safety of residents, and I have already witnessed that in the case of a pipeline explosion in my district.

I just think that what the Republicans are doing is blaming FERC and that they are trying to come up with a solution for a problem that doesn't exist; but in the process of all of that, they are going to jeopardize the possibility of the fact that some of these pipelines might be approved without enough safety or environmental or health concerns. It seems to me that it makes no sense at all to put FERC in

the position of deciding issues with regard to statutes like the Clean Water Act and the Endangered Species Act, which they really have nothing to do with.

We considered this bill in the last Congress, Mr. Speaker, and FERC made it clear that it was not necessary or helpful, and the administration threatened to veto the bill. Nothing has changed. The administration has again threatened to veto this bill. It is very early in this new Congress. I remain committed to developing sound energy policy with my Republican colleagues. If they want to have some hearings on this bill and go through the regular order of the committee process, that is fine as there will be more opportunity to review it.

I don't think this bill will help anyone, but I think it may hurt a lot of people, including those who want to build the pipeline. Instead of spending our time debating a bill that will never become law, I hope we can begin soon to have some serious discussion about sound and sustainable energy policy. In the meantime, I would urge my colleagues to vote against this particular piece of legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in summation, I urge the passage of H.R. 161, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would note once again that, during the hearings on this legislation, Commissioners at FERC—both Republican and Democrat—said that more accountability was needed for agencies that issue permits that are necessary to construct natural gas pipelines.

Many people have raised the issue that the President has said he would veto this bill. That is his job, that is his responsibility, and that is the type of government we have. We have a legislative branch, we have an executive branch, and we have a judiciary branch. The legislative branch's responsibility is to pass legislation that it deems necessary. If the President wants to veto it, let him veto it and give his reasons. Then the American people can listen to both sides and decide what they think is the right direction to go.

I would stress once more that the Energy Information Agency data from last year's winter cold snap during the month of January showed that residential natural gas prices in Pennsylvania were 14 percent above the national average; in New Jersey, 18 percent higher; in New York, 24 percent higher; in Vermont, 60 percent higher. One of the reasons given is the lack of infrastructure to get natural gas to where it needs to go in the Northeast.

This is a commonsense bill that is being presented to help solve this problem of energy needs in America. If we are going to be competitive in the global marketplace, yes, we need good, low-cost residential electricity prices, but we also need low-cost manufacturing and heavy industry electricity prices in

order to compete in the global marketplace. That is what H.R. 161 is about, and I would urge Members to support this legislation that was drafted by Mr. POMPEO of Kansas.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 161, a bill that claims to expedite applications for construction of natural gas pipelines in the United States.

First, let me say as a native Houstonian and as a Democrat, I support American energy development.

The energy revolution that has taken place over the last decade is unlike anything I've seen in my lifetime.

The natural gas plays currently developed in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Texas are solely responsible for the recovery the U.S. has seen.

Low natural gas prices have given our industries an advantage over international competitors.

Low natural gas prices have given our homeowners cheaper electric bills.

Low natural gas prices have resulted in lower emissions and smaller contributions to climate change.

To reap those benefits, however, we need pipelines to move that product from the field to market.

I can confidently say, I am a big supporter of pipelines.

The stacks of raw materials and finished pipe in my district are probably unlike any other district in the country.

Pipelines are the most economically efficient and environmentally sound method of moving oil and natural.

I am an advocate of building more pipelines.

I have co-sponsored legislation to build domestic and international pipelines to facilitate energy development.

I have advocated for expediting the application process, so that our federal agencies provide private investors certainty.

Unfortunately, I cannot support H.R. 161.

While I am an advocate of all things natural gas, I am not in favor of completely circumventing the permitting process.

About a decade ago, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), which has jurisdiction over pipeline approvals, had some issues.

We worked closely with the industry and the agency to improve the processes and timelines so that we could get pipe built in this country quickly.

FERC has done an admirable job working with industry and other key stakeholders to improve the process.

Currently, FERC approves the majority of permits in less than 18-to-24 months.

Where there are problems and delays with other permits, namely at the local and state level and FERC is working to resolve those issues.

Unfortunately, this bill does nothing to address those issues.

This bill sets a timeline for FERC and if that timeline expires, then any permit is approved.

Our federal agencies have an oversight role to play and allowing permit applications to essentially "run out the clock" when issues arise is a way to circumvent our federal process.

In Energy and Commerce, we put a lot of work into this bill and I want to thank my colleagues for working closely with our side.

But, I cannot support H.R. 161 and I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill as well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 38, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. PALLONE. I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Pallone moves to recommit the bill H.R. 161 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 3. PIPELINE OWNER RESPONSIBILITY IN THE EVENT OF AN EXPLOSION.

The provisions of this Act shall not take effect unless the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, in consultation with appropriate regulatory agencies, determines that in the implementation of this Act—

(1) taxpayers will not be held liable for any repair or environmental cleanup from a natural gas pipeline explosion; and

(2) pipeline owners will bear full responsibility for damages in any community resulting from a natural gas pipeline explosion, including for loss of life.

Mr. WHITFIELD (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned during the general debate, I and my constituents witnessed and went through a few years ago, when I was in Congress, a natural gas pipeline explosion. It was devastating to the community. We had many people who lost their homes. It was, actually, several apartment buildings. Even to this day, the memory of that is very much ingrained in the minds of the residents of Durham Woods, which is the largest municipality that I represent in Edison, New Jersey.

Basically, what we are saying in this motion to recommit is that the provisions of this act will not take effect unless the FERC determines that taxpayers will not be held liable for any repair or environmental cleanup from a gas pipeline explosion and that the pipeline owners will bear full responsibility for the damage to the community resulting from a natural gas pipeline explosion, including loss of life. It seems to me that that is the minimum we should expect when there is such an explosion.

Believe me. At the time that that explosion occurred in Durham Woods in my district, there were many instances when we had to have environmental cleanups and when the community was exposed to tremendous damage. It seems to me that, under the circumstances, this motion to recommit makes perfect sense.

Mr. Speaker, let me point out that there have been many pipeline explosions, but I am not going to go through the entire list. In fact, the one in my district is one that is mentioned here. Beginning in just the last 10 or 15 years, there have been numerous explosions, so we are not talking about something that doesn't happen.

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. AGUILAR).

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, natural gas pipeline explosions do happen.

Last week, a pipeline exploded in Mississippi. Last year, pipelines exploded in Minnesota, Nebraska, North Dakota, and Kentucky. In 2013, a pipeline south of Dallas exploded. Reports described the massive explosion as "shooting flames high in the air and prompting evacuations from nearby homes and a school district," with black smoke visible for some 20 miles. In 2010, a natural gas pipeline exploded in San Bruno, California, in my home State, causing an explosion that killed eight people and destroyed 38 homes. Even as technology has improved, pipelines have failed.

We should make clear with this legislation that, in the event of the catastrophic failure of a pipeline, taxpayers are not liable for the hundreds of millions or billions of dollars in damages that these explosions can cause. Companies are responsible for the safety and reliability of their pipelines, and we should ensure that they are also liable for the damages caused by those pipelines.

□ 1500

Last year, when this very bill came before the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the president of the Pipeline Safety Trust testified. This group is a national, independent, nonprofit watchdog organization created using funds from a settlement reached in the aftermath of a pipeline explosion in Washington State that killed three people. The Trust's president testified that "rushed, or worse, incomplete reviews resulting in automatic approvals pose a threat to public safety."

To be clear, this is not an organization that opposes new pipelines. They only focus on pipeline safety, and they have serious problems with this bill and its effects on public safety for new pipelines. Their president pointed out that this bill treats a "10-mile pipeline across a barren desert the same as a 1,400-mile pipeline that crosses multiple ecosystems and through dense population areas where it could pose a threat to the life or property of citizens living nearby."

Mr. Speaker, pipelines can fail. And those failures can have disastrous ef-

fects on communities and the environment. This commonsense amendment would protect taxpayers from ever having to pay the costs of a pipeline explosion. I hope we never see another natural gas pipeline explosion, but that would require that history not repeat itself.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this motion to recommit and to vote against the underlying bill because of the danger it poses to the communities and the environment.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, once again, I listened to my colleague from California talk about the dangers from pipelines. These dangers are real. We have had many explosions over the years, including in my own district. I think this bill really puts at risk the possibility of another pipeline explosion. It doesn't provide for enough safety or environmental review.

I urge that Members support the motion to recommit because, at a minimum, it would provide some liability in some way to effectuate a cleanup and pay for the damages that come from an explosion that might take place.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order and claim the time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation is withdrawn.

The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey and the gentleman from New York for raising this safety issue because, obviously, safety is of paramount importance to all of us. That is why we do have the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, or PHMSA, which has the responsibility of making sure that these pipelines operate in as safe a manner as possible. We also recognize that we never get to a point where it is absolutely safe.

Really, H.R. 161 does not have anything to do with PHMSA. Our committee does have jurisdiction over PHMSA. We have had a lot of hearings on it. We are going to continue to have hearings because we want to maximize pipeline safety.

This legislation is not about anything except perfecting the 2005 Energy Policy Act that gave FERC the quarterbacking authority for approving these natural gas pipelines from the aspect of their impact on clean water, clean air, and endangered species.

And so this legislation simply gives FERC the authority that many of its Commissioners asked for, and that is that they have some authority to convince these agencies to start looking at the impacts of the applications earlier in the process rather than at the end. And so even after the 1-year process is over, they still have 90 days. They may ask for another 30 days.

Because of that reason—that this is not a pipeline safety bill, it is a process

bill—I would respectfully request that we defeat this motion to recommit. And I look forward to working with the gentleman from New Jersey and others on pipeline safety as we have hearings and legislation about PHMSA.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 182, nays 241, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 40]

YEAS—182

| | | |
|---------------|----------------|------------------|
| Adams | Foster | Meeks |
| Aguilar | Frankel (FL) | Meng |
| Ashford | Fudge | Moore |
| Bass | Gabbard | Moulton |
| Beatty | Gallego | Murphy (FL) |
| Becerra | Garamendi | Nadler |
| Bera | Graham | Napolitano |
| Beyer | Grayson | Neal |
| Bishop (GA) | Green, Al | Nolan |
| Blumenauer | Grijalva | Norcross |
| Bonamici | Gutiérrez | O'Rourke |
| Boyle (PA) | Hahn | Pallone |
| Brady (PA) | Heck (WA) | Pascarell |
| Brown (FL) | Higgins | Payne |
| Brownley (CA) | Himes | Pelosi |
| Bustos | Honda | Peters |
| Butterfield | Hoyer | Peterson |
| Capps | Huffman | Pingree |
| Capuano | Israel | Pocan |
| Cardenas | Jackson Lee | Polis |
| Carney | Jeffries | Price (NC) |
| Carson (IN) | Johnson (GA) | Quigley |
| Cartwright | Johnson, E. B. | Rangel |
| Castor (FL) | Jones | Rice (NY) |
| Castro (TX) | Kaptur | Richmond |
| Chu (CA) | Keating | Roybal-Allard |
| Ciçilline | Kelly (IL) | Ruiz |
| Clark (MA) | Kennedy | Ruppersberger |
| Clarke (NY) | Kildee | Rush |
| Clay | Kilmer | Ryan (OH) |
| Cleaver | Kind | Sánchez, Linda |
| Clyburn | Kirkpatrick | T. |
| Cohen | Kuster | Sanchez, Loretta |
| Connolly | Langevin | Sarbanes |
| Conyers | Larsen (WA) | Schakowsky |
| Cooper | Larson (CT) | Schiff |
| Costa | Lawrence | Schrader |
| Courtney | Lee | Scott (VA) |
| Crowley | Levin | Scott, David |
| Cuellar | Lewis | Serrano |
| Cummings | Lieu (CA) | Sewell (AL) |
| Davis (CA) | Lipinski | Sherman |
| Davis, Danny | Loebach | Sinema |
| DeFazio | Lofgren | Sires |
| DeGette | Lowenthal | Slaughter |
| Delaney | Lowey | Smith (WA) |
| DeLauro | Lujan Grisham | Speier |
| DelBene | (NM) | Swalwell (CA) |
| DeSaulnier | Lujan, Ben Ray | Takai |
| Deutch | (NM) | Takano |
| Dingell | Lynch | Thompson (CA) |
| Doggett | Maloney, | Thompson (MS) |
| Doyle (PA) | Carolyn | Titus |
| Edwards | Maloney, Sean | Tonko |
| Ellison | Matsui | Torres |
| Engel | McCollum | Tsongas |
| Eshoo | McDermott | Van Hollen |
| Esty | McGovern | Vargas |
| Fattah | McNerney | Veasey |

Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emmer
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garratt
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graham
Grassley
Guthrie
Hahn
Hartzer
Harris
Hatch
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (TX)
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
McMurray
McNulty
Meadows
Meehan
Meyer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mullins
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—10

Carter (TX)
Duckworth
Farr
Forbes

□ 1532

Messrs. GROTHMAN, BARLETTA, CLAWSON of Florida, BURGESS, MOOLENAAR, HUELSKAMP, and

Welch
Yarmuth

Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

Hastings
Hinojosa
Johnson, Sam
Nunnelee

Perlmuter
Wilson (FL)

YODER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Messrs. RUPPERS-BERGER, JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. ADAMS, and Mr. CUELLAR changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 253, nays 169, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 41]

YEAS—253

| | | |
|---------------|-----------------|-------------|
| Abraham | Fincher | Loudermilk |
| Aderholt | Fitzpatrick | Love |
| Allen | Fleischmann | Lucas |
| Amash | Fleming | Luetkemeyer |
| Amodei | Flores | Lummis |
| Ashford | Fortenberry | MacArthur |
| Babin | Fox | Marchant |
| Barletta | Franks (AZ) | Marino |
| Barr | Frelinghuysen | Massie |
| Barton | Garrett | McCarthy |
| Benishek | Gibbs | McCaul |
| Bilirakis | Gibson | McClintock |
| Bishop (MI) | Gohmert | McHenry |
| Bishop (UT) | Goodlatte | McKinley |
| Black | Gosar | McMorris |
| Blackburn | Gowdy | Rodgers |
| Blum | Graham | McSally |
| Bost | Granger | Meadows |
| Boustany | Graves (GA) | Meehan |
| Boyle (PA) | Graves (LA) | Messer |
| Brady (PA) | Graves (MO) | Mica |
| Brady (TX) | Griffith | Miller (FL) |
| Bridenstine | Grothman | Miller (MI) |
| Brooks (AL) | Guinta | Moolenaar |
| Brooks (IN) | Guthrie | Mooney (WV) |
| Buchanan | Hanna | Mullin |
| Buck | Hardy | Mulvaney |
| Bucshon | Harper | Murphy (FL) |
| Burgess | Harris | Murphy (PA) |
| Bustos | Hartzer | Neugebauer |
| Byrne | Heck (NV) | Newhouse |
| Calvert | Hensarling | Noem |
| Carter (GA) | Herrera Beutler | Norcross |
| Chabot | Hice (GA) | Nugent |
| Chaffetz | Hill | Nunes |
| Clawson (FL) | Holding | Olson |
| Coffman | Hudson | Palazzo |
| Cole | Huelskamp | Palmer |
| Collins (GA) | Huizenga (MI) | Paulsen |
| Collins (NY) | Hultgren | Pearce |
| Comstock | Hunter | Perry |
| Conaway | Hurd (TX) | Peters |
| Cook | Hurt (VA) | Peterson |
| Costa | Issa | Pittenger |
| Costello (PA) | Jenkins (KS) | Pitts |
| Cramer | Jenkins (WV) | Poe (TX) |
| Crawford | Johnson (OH) | Poliquin |
| Crenshaw | Jolly | Pompeo |
| Cuellar | Jones | Posey |
| Culberson | Jordan | Price (GA) |
| Curbelo (FL) | Joyce | Ratcliffe |
| Davis, Rodney | Katko | Reed |
| Denham | Kelly (PA) | Reichert |
| Dent | King (IA) | Renacci |
| DeSantis | King (NY) | Ribble |
| DesJarlais | Kinzinger (IL) | Rice (SC) |
| Diaz-Balart | Kline | Rigell |
| Dold | Knight | Roby |
| Duffy | Labrador | Roe (TN) |
| Duncan (SC) | LaMalfa | Rogers (AL) |
| Duncan (TN) | Lance | Rogers (KY) |
| Ellmers | Latta | Rohrabacher |
| Emmer | LoBiondo | Rokita |
| Farenthold | Long | Rooney (FL) |

Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema

Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker

Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—169

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu (CA)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle (PA)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard

Gallego
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu (CA)
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Nadler

Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarella
Payne
Pelosi
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Brat
Carter (TX)
Duckworth
Forbes

Hastings
Heck (WA)
Hinojosa
Johnson, Sam

Lamborn
Nunnelee
Perlmutter

□ 1542

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN
STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 40

Resolved, That the following named Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—Ms. Adams, Ms. Graham, and Mr. Ashford.

(2) COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET.—Mr. Yarmuth (to rank immediately after Mr. Van Hollen), Mr. Norcross, and Mr. Moulton.

(3) COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION.—Ms. Lofgren and Mr. Vargas.

(4) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—Mrs. Torres, Mrs. Dingell, Mr. Takai, and Mr. Gallego.

(5) COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM.—Mr. Lieu of California, Mrs. Watson Coleman, Ms. Plaskett, Mr. DeSaulnier, and Mr. Brendan F. Boyle of Pennsylvania.

(6) COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY.—Mr. Beyer.

(7) COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS.—Mrs. Lawrence.

(8) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—Miss Rice of New York.

Mr. BECERRA (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1545

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL
EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO
TERRORISTS WHO THREATEN TO
DISRUPT THE MIDDLE EAST
PEACE PROCESS—MESSAGE
FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE
UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114–
5)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared with respect

to foreign terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process is to continue in effect beyond January 23, 2015.

The crisis with respect to grave acts of violence committed by foreign terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process that led to the declaration of a national emergency on January 23, 1995, has not been resolved. Terrorist groups continue to engage in activities that have the purpose or effect of threatening the Middle East peace process and that are hostile to United States interests in the region. Such actions continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared with respect to foreign terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process and to maintain in force the sanctions against them to respond to this threat.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 21, 2015.

MARCH FOR LIFE

(Mr. MULLIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I believe every life is a gift. Our Nation was built on the right to life. Our Founding Fathers wrote that all men are created equal and that we are endowed by the Creator with certain undeniable rights: the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Our government was instituted to secure these rights, not take them away.

Mr. Speaker, I stand with hundreds of thousands of people from across the country who have traveled to our Nation's Capital to tell lawmakers that we must protect the innocent and that we must fight for those who cannot defend themselves. I am proud of the many young people who are in Washington, D.C., this week to defend life. You are a voice for the voiceless, and you are the future.

I am proud to join so many of my colleagues in this Chamber today to defend life and spread this message that every life is a gift.

PAYCHECK PROGRESS

(Mr. SWALWELL of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, as the President noted in his State of the Union address last evening, we should be proud of the progress we have made since the Great Recession. But there is too much to do still on growth, especially on the issue of paycheck progress.

For most Americans, especially in the San Francisco Bay Area, here is our reality: costs all around us are